



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/903,838

07/11/2001

Richard E. Fangman

5686-00300

2194

40401 7590 07/01/2009
Hershkovitz & Associates, LLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2419

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/01/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@hershkovitz.net
patent@hershkovitz.net

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/903,838	Applicant(s) FANGMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Andrew C. Lee	Art Unit 2419	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Andrew C. Lee. (3) ____.

(2) Ed Garcia-Otero. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 23 June 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 60.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 6958992, US 6822957, US 6772210.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claims 1 and 60 were broadly discussed in light of the prior arts, no agreement was reached; however, applicant's representative suggested to modify claim 1 for more specified claim subject matter.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Andrew C Lee/ Examiner, Art Unit 2419	/Ayaz R. Sheikh/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419
---	--